

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated March 12, 2003, the drawings are objected to. Claims 1, 8 and 18 are rejected under obviousness-type double patenting. Claims 12, 13, and 18 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b). Claims 12, 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a).

In view of the amendments to the claims and for the reasons set forth hereafter, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in claims 1 and 18, as well as claims 8 and 13 which depend from claim 1, include features which as not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited references, taken singly or in any permissible combination. Reconsideration is, therefore, respectfully requested.

The drawings are objected to. Accordingly, a proposed drawing correction is submitted therewith and shows in red the revision to the second use of reference numeral 212 to reference numeral 207. The specification on page 16 is revised accordingly.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the changes made by the Examiner to the specification.

Applicants submit a further change to the first listed amendment made by the Examiner. The "USP 6,178,584" was added by the Examiner in an Examiner's Amendment.

Claims 1, 8 and 18 are rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-11 of US Patent No. 6,178,584. Applicants are willing to submit a Terminal Disclaimer over the claims of US Patent No. 6,178,584 upon receiving an indication of allowable subject matter in the instant application.

Claims 12, 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, claim 18 has been amended to address the language noted by the Examiner. The subject matter of claim 12 which has now been incorporated into claim 1, has also been amended to properly define the first end of the housing as being a tubular first end portion.

In view of these amendments, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in claims 1, 13 and 18 is particularly pointed out and distinctly claimed.

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by four different references. However, it is respectfully submitted that, in view of amendments to claim 1 which define the handle as having a tubular end portion and means integrally carried on the first end for preventing lateral disengagement of the handle from the receiver, claim 1 includes features which are not anticipated by each of the cited references. The references lack any integral lateral disengagement preventing means.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin in view of Grubber. The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to have modified the handle connection of Rubin to include the clip and rod shaped element of Grubber as such a connection would be much easier to disengage.

However, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in claim 1, which has been amended, in part, to include the elements of claim 12, includes features which are not rendered obvious by the combination of references posed by the Examiner.

First, it is noted that Rubin is entirely devoid of any teaching or suggestion of making the handle easily removable via a snap connection to a receiver on the cleaning element mounting plate. While the handle of Rubin can be disengaged from the plate by removing the nut, this clearly is not a snap connection as defined by the Applicants in claim 1.

Grubber, as noted by the Examiner, provides a snap connection of a rod on one end of a handle to a paint coating plate.

It is submitted that the Examiner has failed to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness to support a legitimate combination of the teachings of Rubin and Grubber in support of a rejection of claim 1. Rubin teaches away from a releasable snap-in connection. Thus, it is submitted that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art provide a snap-in connection in Rubin since Rubin is devoid of any such teaching.

Secondly, lateral disengagement of the tubular rod in Grubber is prevented by the separate latch block 7 and separate locking grooves 8 mounted on the top surface of the base plate. The latch block is separate from the tubular rod connected to the end of the handle. Thus, Grubber fails to teach or suggest the integral means carried on the first end portion of the handle for preventing lateral disengagement of the handle from the receiver as set forth by the Applicants in claim 1.

For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in claim 1, as well as claim 13 which depends therefrom, includes features which are not suggested or rendered obvious by any permissible combination of Rubin and Grubber.

Finally, claim 18 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonis in view of UK 406,211. However, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be led to combine the teachings of the two cited references.

It is respectfully submitted that the teachings of Bonis and the UK reference are opposed to one another such an extent that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably motivated by either reference to combine the references into a cleaning assembly meeting the features of Applicants' invention set forth in claim 18.

Bonis teaches a cleaning apparatus having a clamp which traps a generally rectangular paper towel around the periphery of the backing elements. Only the portion of the paper towel which wraps around the outer surface and the periphery of the backing elements conforms to the shape of the backing elements. Any excess peripheral material on the towel projects outward from the clamp.

In the UK reference, the cleaning cloth 14 is made in the shape of a pocket with an aperture carrying a rubber draw ring. The cloth fits over a plate connected to a handle.

It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be led to combine the teachings of the UK reference with Bonis due to the entirely different cleaning element mounting means taught in both references. Substituting the cleaning element of the UK reference for the cleansing assembly of


Bonis would require the elimination of the clamping ring and the use of a specially formed UK cleaning element in place of the standard paper towel in Bonis. It is respectfully submitted that any motivation for such a combination clearly appears to be obtained from the impermissible use of Applicants' invention as a teaching or suggestion for such a combination.

For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in claim 18 patentably defines over any permissible combination of the cited references.

In summary, for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all objections and rejections have been addressed and overcome. It is further submitted that Applicants' invention as set forth in claims 1, 8, 13 and 18 includes features which are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited references, taken singly or in any permissible combination. Claims 1, 8, 13 and 18 are submitted to be in condition for allowance; a notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG, BASILE, HANLON, MacFARLANE, WOOD  
& HELMHOLDT, P.C.



William M. Hanlon, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 28422  
(248) 649-3333

3001 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 624  
Troy, Michigan 48084-3107

Dated: June 12, 2003  
WMH/jao